

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated June 7, 2004, and a summary of the telephonic interview conducted between the undersigned and the Examiner on September 7, 2004.

The Office Action maintained a rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In maintaining the Office Action, page 4 of the Office Action explained the Examiner's belief that Figure 12 of the subject application shows air outlet B410 in communication with suction port B123 through the interior of ink container B416.

At the interview, the Examiner confirmed that he had misinterpreted the meaning of the pair of dotted lines shown in Figure 12. These dotted lines do not show a connection between suction port B123 and the interior of ink container B416; rather, these dotted lines depict a pathway positioned behind ink tank B400, as confirmed at paragraph [0062] on page 26 and also at paragraph [0049] on page 21 (which refers to Figure 8).


In view of the interview, the Examiner agreed to withdraw his rejection under § 112, and to withdraw his objections to the specification based on the subject matter of Claim 18.

As for the objections lodged against Claims 6 and 25 for incorrect capitalization of the word "ink", the amendments above attend to this.

No other matters being raised in the Office Action, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such actions are courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants  
Michael K. O'Neill  
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 85691v1